Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development

ISSN: 0143-4632 (Print) 1747-7557 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmmm20

Language contact and translingual literacies

Serafín M. Coronel-Molina & Beth L. Samuelson

To cite this article: Serafín M. Coronel-Molina & Beth L. Samuelson (2016): Language contact and translingual literacies, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2016.1186681

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1186681

JOURNAL OF MULTILINGUAL AND MULTICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT, 2016
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1186681

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Language contact and translingual literacies

Serafín M. Coronel-Molina and Beth L. Samuelson

Department of Literacy, Culture, and Language Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

ABSTRACT

In this essay we examine the notions of language contact phenomena such as borrowing, codeswitching, codemixing, codemeshing, and translanguaging. We also explore the concepts of translingualism and translingual literacies. We discuss how the notions of bilingualism and multilingualism are differentiated from translingualism and translingual literacies, and how these concepts came into existence according to different theoretical positions. We also introduce the contents of the other articles included in this special issue, and highlight their key points, framing them in the context of research on translingual literacies. The following six areas from around the world are covered: (1) negotiating voice in translingual literacies, (2) Amerindian and translingual literacies, (3) translingual and transcultural practice in a rural classroom, (4) translingual and transcultural navigation among immigrant children and youth, (5) créolisation and the new cosmopolitanism, and (6) translingual practice among African immigrants in the USA. Last but not least, we include two book reviews related to translingual literacies, and we also provide some conclusions on the topics discussed, as well as some suggestions for further directions in future research.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 28 April 2016
Accepted 3 May 2016

KEYWORDS
Codeswitching; codemixing; codemeshing; multilingualism; translingual literacies; translingualism

Language contact phenomena

Language contact happens when two or more different languages, varieties, or even just people from different linguistic backgrounds interact with each other across time and space. It is not uncommon to find it at linguistic borders between adstratum languages. Such borders can be created through migration and diasporic movements, where an intrusive language may serve as either a superstratum or a substratum. Language contact may lead to a number of results, including language convergence, borrowing, and relexification. Probably the most familiar results are the development of pidgins or creoles, codeswitching, and mixed languages (Wikipedia).

According to Sankoff (2001),

> [L]anguage contact is part of the social fabric of everyday life for hundreds of millions of people the world over … [T]he linguistic outcomes of language contact are determined in large part by the history of social relations among populations, including economic, political and demographic factors. (638–639)[1]

Cultural vs. core borrowings

One of the simplest and most common effects of language contact is borrowing between languages, where one language may 'loan' a word to another language. There are two basic forms of loanwords. If a word is borrowed from another culture to identify a thing or express a concept not already in the borrowing culture, it is known as a cultural borrowing. The Japanese word *sushi*, the Chinese concept

CONTACT Serafín M. Coronel-Molina scoronel@indiana.edu

paper tiger and the Swahili word *safari* are prime examples. If, on the other hand, the borrowed term already has a rough equivalent in the borrowing language, it is known as a core borrowing, such as, for example, Quechua's adoption of Spanish names for days of the week, although it already had its own names for them. As this example shows, although words can be borrowed or lent from any language to any other language, it often seems to be the case that the higher status language does the lending while the lower status language does the borrowing. Colonisation and colonialism, as happened between Quechua and Spanish when Spain conquered what is now Hispanic America, are classic cases of linguistic borrowing/lending situations.

Another similar factor that contributes to one language lending more than others may be the key role it plays in a great civilisation. For instance, innumerable Chinese words have been borrowed into many East Asian and South-East Asian languages, including Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese. Even so-called 'dead' languages like Sanskrit or Latin still offer an extensive source of linguistic elements used by many modern languages. In this regard, they are still culturally very relevant; their only 'death' is in not being used as a mother tongue by any language communities.

And research has shown that it is not only individual words that are borrowed or lent. In fact, nearly anything can be borrowed, from the most basic sounds all the way up to entire grammatical categories, including meanings, affixes, inflections, and even syntax. To be sure, though, words and lexical elements are more easily borrowed than phonological or grammatical elements. And among these, what are known as open word classes, or categories of words that easily accept new additions (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, etc.), by their very nature are more likely to lend to or borrow from other languages than are closed word classes (pronouns, pre- and postpositions, conjunctions, etc.). This is logical, given the rather fixed functions that closed word classes serve, which do not require much change and thus do not feel the need for new additions (Language Contact, 1–4).

Codeswitching, codemixing, and codemeshing[2]

In a contact situation, it is common to hear a bilingual or multilingual speaker alternate between two or three languages, depending on the context and the purpose of the communicative situation. This phenomenon is known as codeswitching. According to Baker and Jones (1998), codeswitching is 'changing languages within a single conversation. This frequently happens when bilingual speakers meet other bilingual speakers. When they interact, they consciously or unconsciously choose the language in which they will carry out the conversation' (58). Bilingual or multilingual speakers who codeswitch do it for a variety of reasons, and can depend on the interlocutor (age, sex, social position), the topic of conversation, and the environment in which the interaction occurs. Traditionally, those who codeswitch in their interactions with other people have been considered linguistically incompetent, but in reality this is an extraordinary linguistic ability. Thanks to studies conducted in the last 20 years, it has been demonstrated that codeswitching is a very complex and sophisticated process that follows its own rules and restrictions (Baker and Jones 1998, 60–61).

It follows, then, that codeswitching involves greater fluency in two (or more) languages than borrowing does. Since borrowing implies that a given word or form from one language has already become part of the other language, a speaker of this other language does not really need to know the first language to use the word or form; however, to codeswitch, he or she does need to know at least some of both languages. One of these is 'the language we are speaking', or the primary language (which is typically the mother tongue of one or more of the interlocutors), and the other is the secondary language. For instance, in the sentence '*Mi abuela* gave me *una chompa feísima* for my *cumpleaños*, but Mom says I have to thank her anyway', English is the primary language, with three instances of codeswitching into Spanish, the secondary language. There is more English than Spanish in the sentence, which is, furthermore, dominated by English grammar. This pattern tends to be the norm in codeswitching, with individual words or short phrases from the secondary language, but most of the grammar coming from the primary language. It is possible, but not common, for the primary language to switch during one stretch of discourse (e.g. one person's speaking

turn), although it may change frequently over the course of an entire conversation, since the choice of primary language and degree of codeswitching is often decided by communal norms rather than just individual choice (Language Contact, 6–7).

Another phenomenon is codemixing, where the L1 and L2 are mixed within the same word. Both cases imply the transference of linguistic elements from one language to the other, occurring at the phonological, morphological, grammatical, or lexical level (Crystal 1997, 66). The primary difference is that codeswitching occurs at sentence or discourse level, while codemixing takes place at the level of words or morphemes (see Winford 2003 for further discussion). It is worth noting that codemixing is generally an unconscious process. It seems to be common among bilingual children and teenagers, who seem to spontaneously mix L1 and L2 at the lexical and morphological level, but more in-depth studies are needed to verify this observation; this clearly suggests a new variety in formation. In addition, codemixing will vary from context to context and from individual to individual. Finally, it should always be kept in mind that in a contact situation, it is very natural that both languages influence one another.

A final phenomenon is codemeshing, which is the combination of local, vernacular, or colloquial varieties of a language used in daily interaction in order to embrace and articulate a host of local and global ways of being and seeing the world. According to Canagarajah (2006, 602), 'code meshing is a strategy for merging local varieties with standard written Englishes in a move toward gradually pluralizing academic writing and developing multilingual competence for transnational relationships'. In fact, recent theory proposes that using codemeshing is a preferable approach over codeswitching for teaching reading, writing, speaking, and visual representation to diverse learners. For instance, the essays in Young and Martinez's (2011) edited volume 'argue that code-meshing … leads to lucid, often dynamic prose' by people who speak and write 'nonstandard' world Englishes, or those for whom English is not their first language. The authors represented in this volume – working in fields ranging from international and national literacy studies to English education, writing studies, sociolinguistics, and critical pedagogy – acknowledge that implementing a codemeshing pedagogy is not an easy task, but it is well worth the work because '*all* writers and speakers benefit when we demystify academic language and encourage students to explore the plurality of the English language in both unofficial and official spaces' (Young and Martinez 2011, back cover).

Sánchez Martín (2103) notes that there are implications for using both codeswitching and codemeshing in communication. She believes that codeswitching is more commonly used in oral communication because of its greater application at the lexical or syntactical level. Codemeshing, on the other hand, is more embedded at the discourse level, and so may be more applicable for written communication. In consequence, the pragmatics of their use also varies widely. For instance, codeswitching can be a common tactic to 'negotiate identities', to create solidarity with one's interlocutor(s). Codemeshing, on the other hand, is an act of resistance (Michael-Luna and Canagarajah 2007, 58) against the hegemonic 'standard' language. Sánchez Martín sees it as 'related to the cognitive realm of language use due to the complexity of the skills needed to produce discourse in which local and vernacular aspects of a language are integrated'. Simply put, it takes less mental effort to switch codes than to mesh them; this applies to speakers, hearers, and readers alike. Given that both (or all) participants in a given communicative situation likely know both codes, none of the parties has to make much effort to understand meaning when simply switching from one code to the other. Since they share the same knowledge, codeswitching is fairly natural, and even spontaneous. And while codemeshing can also occur at the lexical level, its use at the discourse level reads 'as an act of resistance … not necessarily directed at people who belong to the same social/linguistic community as the speaker' (Sánchez Martín 2013, online), which means that, depending on who the readers are, they might have to work a lot harder, cognitively speaking, to completely understand the message.

Sánchez Martín (2013) is also in favour of incorporating codemeshing in the classroom, noting that it is an effective way to lower students' affective filters, both in English-based content classes and in foreign language classrooms. She relates her own experience as a teacher in a Spanish classroom, where her combined use of judicious codemeshing *and* codeswitching helped students begin

to make connections between the two languages, and helped them start feeling more comfortable with both languages sooner and using the L2 language much more (online).

Translanguaging

According to Garcia and Wei (2014, 2–22), the term *translanguaging* was coined by Williams (1994, 1996), and originally referred to the pedagogical practice of having students alternate between languages depending on whether they were using them receptively or productively. For instance, students might be instructed to read in English and write in Welsh or vice versa (Baker 2011). Since then, many scholars have extended and expanded the concept (see e.g. Blackledge and Creese 2010; García 2009; García and Sylvan 2011; Hornberger and Link 2012; Lewis, Jones, and Baker 2012; Wei 2011, among others), defining it slightly differently. According to Kellman (2003), translingual writers are 'those who write in more than one language or in a language other than their primary one' (ix). For Canagarajah (2011), 'translanguaging is the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system' (401), while Cook (2008) considers it to be an ability that is part of the *multicompetence* of bilingual speakers, whose lives, minds, and actions, according to Franceschini (2011), are necessarily different from monolingual speakers due to the simple fact of having two languages coexisting in their minds and interacting in complex ways that always keep both languages in the foreground. Multicompetence refers to the ability of a multilingual individual to view his or her languages as an interconnected whole – as 'an eco-system of mutual interdependence' (Garcia and Wei 2014, 22). The notion of translingualism encompasses semiotic resources and linguistic and cultural histories 'as always emergent, in process (a state of becoming), and their relations as mutually constitutive', instead of 'treating these [semiotic resources] as discrete, preexisting, stable, and enumerable entities' (Lu and Horner 2013, 587).

Translanguaging differs from codeswitching at a conceptual level. Where codeswitching refers simply to the act of shifting between two languages, translanguaging has to do with a speaker's 'construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speaker's complete language repertoire' (Garcia and Wei 2014, 22). In other words, translanguaging involves *multiple discursive practices* that bilinguals have at their disposal, and they use them in novel and complex ways in order to *make sense of their bilingual worlds* (García 2009, 45):

> A translanguaging lens posits that bilinguals have *one linguistic repertoire* from which they select features *strategically* to communicate effectively. That is, translanguaging takes as its starting point the *language practices of bilingual people as the norm*, and not the language of monolinguals, as described by traditional usage books and grammars. (García 2012, 1, emphasis in the original)

Where extended families or entire communities are bi- or multilingual, translanguaging would appear to be the discursive norm. Consider, for example, a family reunion where different branches of the family speak different varieties or even different languages (i.e. they have different language practices). The only way to communicate between the different branches is to translanguage: speakers will need to utilise certain elements of their multilingual repertoires, while ignoring others. Or for another example, a bilingual family might choose to discuss a school event by choosing elements from their repertoires associated with the society's dominant language, whereas that same family might select very different features when talking about intimate relationships. Sometimes, a family will translanguage precisely because it permits fluid language practices, and allows them, within the intimacy of the family, to free themselves from 'external social conventions that tie them to one or another "language"' (Garcia and Wei 2014, 23). This type of situation would constitute a *translanguaging space*, where multilingual individuals feel free to ignore 'the artificial dichotomies between the macro and micro, the societal and the individual' (Wei 2011, 1234). That is, such a

practice allows them to create a new space that integrates previously disparate social spaces and their concomitant 'language codes' (Garcia and Wei 2014, 24).

Multilingual literacies and translingual literacies

The articles in this special issue contribute to research on the enactment of plurilingualism or translingualism in academia and beyond (Marshall and Moore 2013). Much recent work has focused on implications for teaching academic writing skills to international students in English-medium universities (Canagarajah 2013a) or on acclimatising multilingual and multicultural students (Kramsch 2009) to university life and studies. Of particular interest are academic literacies. The codemeshing, codemixing, and translanguaging practices that allow multilingual families or social groups to create integrative social spaces through fluid language practices meet mixed reception in contexts where academic literacies are valued and taught. Various kinds of language contact and their relationship to literacy (reading and writing) have been the source ongoing controversy, in part because the ideologies of written communication are often still informed by a monolingual paradigm that values efficiency in communication and that focuses on form and grammar over embedded social practices, particularly in academic settings.

Under a monolingual paradigm, the exclusion of other languages and the use of a sole, shared, common language might be seen as the most effective and concise means of conveying complex arguments or ideas. Native speaker norms may place cosmopolitan, multilingual and non-native users of the shared code at a relative disadvantage, so the line of reasoning goes, but their best interest is to learn it as well as they can and conform to existing norms, else risk being outsiders in the discourse community. This perspective fits hand-in-glove with the great divide theories of literacy that are so thoroughly debunked in work done by the New Literacy Studies (Street 1994). Writing is not 'a technology that restructures thought' (Ong 1986, 23), but the theorising that develops alternate models still goes on largely in one language, English.

Communication in other languages – inclusive of translanguaging, codemixing, or codemeshing – are semiotic practices that are still largely at the boundaries of academic literacy as acts that challenge and resist the hegemony of standard English. Translingual literacies prompt a deep and highly controversial reconsideration of the largely unchallenged position that scholarly communication must proceed in a common language in order to effective. A translingual perspective highlights literacy as semiosis, reminding us once again that literacy is not about the superiority of the alphabetic literacy or of any given national literature or the privileging of academic skills such as critical thinking as the province of Western thought (Harris 2001).

Augustyn (2012) reviews the impact of a semiotic perspective on language and education, noting that various theorists who have interpreted Charles Sanders Peirce's oeuvre on the semiosis by the meaning-making human mind have noted a theoretical shift if the ways that language educators – namely world languages and second language educators – view language. This semiotic view of language sees language not just as a stand-alone representational tool kit, but as a device that is interconnected with other semiotic devices for representing thoughts, feelings, and ideas. As Danesi notes, 'the attractive aspect of semiotic inquiry is that it is gears towards investigating the premise that all knowledge is connected with representation' (Danesi 2000, 22). Social-ecological models of language learning and language use have displaced conduit models as an orienting view toward language users in their discursive contexts. These models include ecological models of language (Van Lier 2004), multimodality (Kress 2010), and social investment and identity (Pierce 1995).

The Modern Language Association's Executive Council recommended that as part of the goal of educating students to be translingual and transcultural communicators, the ability to operate between languages should highly valued (MLA 2007). Developing this kind of symbolic competence (Kramsch 2009) requires focusing on critical language awareness and sociocultural and historical consciousness, rather than simply focusing on functional language skills with the goal of creating nearly native speakers. This goal is rarely achieved anyway, but the goal of building students who

are competent users of multiple linguistic and symbolic systems is within reach, and is a critical competency for full participation in a 'globalised' world. In other words, students need to become competent at using translingual and transcultural literacy practices and if they are accustomed to translating freely and fluidly between language systems and other semiotic resources, they are more likely to engage in similar practices in multimodal communicative practices.

The linguistic and cultural diversity of globalised societies ensure that the need for translingual awareness and flexibility of communication are not limited to individuals from multilingual backgrounds or to students of world languages. In schools at all grade levels and in college classrooms, it is safe to assume that all instructors will work with students who represent languages and cultural traditions that are different from their own. And this diversity, if viewed as an asset, should be incorporated into curricula and pedagogy, rather than simply accommodated. Speaking about college composition courses specifically, Lovejoy and colleagues have observed that,

> In today's linguistic environment, it no longer makes sense to teach writing as though all students share a common language or dialect. It is time to give serious thought to how our students' language varieties figure into instruction in the teaching of writing. (Lovejoy, Fox, and Wills 2009, 262)

Biased attitudes that assume that there is only one way to write correctly need to be addressed for what they are – another symptom of the 'great divide' attitudes – are distinguishing characteristics of the ability to communicate complex ideas. In preparing multilingual students to be polyliterate, translingual writers and readers, their multilingual abilities should be viewed as assets. The research work of translingual and polylingual literacies needs to address these areas, as well as the attitudes of mainstream students towards World Englishes (Wetzl 2013) – while also pursuing practical and sustainable pedagogical and curricular approaches for supporting and expanding linguistic and cultural diversity.

About the special issue

The present volume explores translingual literacies and the theoretical implications for multicultural and multilingual development that are raised by integrating the contributions of different modes of thought into the study of hybrid and heterogeneous spaces for literacy practices. The essays examine spaces for translingual literacy practices (Canagarajah 2013a, 2013b) in multilingual and multicultural contexts, and how they influence both the local and the global, delving into the 'contact zones' (Pratt 1991, 1992) where grassroots literacies and Indigenous semiotics are in contact and in conflict. In other words, this special issue focuses on hybrid, syncretic and heteroglossic literacies, exploring spaces where grassroots and vernacular literacies meet, intermingle, intertwine, create tensions, and cause misunderstandings.

The conceptual framework takes a critical stance on translingual literacies in global and local spaces, and puts greater emphasis on grassroots and vernacular literacies and Indigenous semiotics. Considering the heterogeneous, hybrid nature of literacy practices, the six contributors to this volume, literacy experts with interdisciplinary research backgrounds, explore the nature and extent of the contact zones of translingual literacies. In fact, translingual literacy practices have not been sufficiently applied in the field of Literacy Studies. The research articles in this special issue on 'Translingual Literacies' discuss the theoretical implications for multicultural and multilingual development, which are raised by integrating the contributions of non-Western modes of thought into the study of hybrid and heterogeneous spaces for literacy practices. The articles address translingual literacies with particular attention to new trends and prospects for Literacy Studies. This research is most relevant to researchers and graduate students in the areas of sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, educational linguistics, policy studies, and literacy studies. Conclusions from the articles are also relevant to language and literacy practitioners, educators, policymakers, language planning agencies, governmental and nongovernmental organisations, academic institutions, and grassroots organisations around the world.

The first article, titled 'Negotiating voice in translingual literacies: From literacy regimes to contact zones', was written by Suresh Canagarajah and Yumi Matsumoto. This article describes the

development of voice and the use of subaltern or translingual norms in academic writing. The authors argue that non-Western communities will have no trouble using their own local literacy norms within local (or domestic) contexts, but once they move to communicate beyond these local literacy regimes, their own literacy practices will be silenced in favour of the elite norms and resources. The article presents a case study of negotiating voice between a Japanese student and her instructor in an American university-level writing course. Ultimately, the voice that resulted in their communications merged the student's own cultural resources and the dominant conventions of academic literacies. This translingual textual realisation was made possible by conceiving of the classroom as a *contact zone* as described by Mary Louise Pratt, a pedagogical approach that provided ecological affordances which allowed for negotiation between competing norms and promoted the evolution of new genres. This required both student and instructor to move beyond their personal comfort zones with regard to discourse styles and learn to appreciate a more hybrid and textured rendition of voice, which was challenging but ultimately well worth the work for both of them. Their findings suggest that international multilingual students may be able to make room for their local literacy resources in translocal literacy regimes, thus challenging the norms of hegemonic communities.

The second article, co-authored by Serafín M. Coronel-Molina and Peter M. Cowan and titled 'Amerindian and translingual literacies across time and space', delves into recent studies that have examined Indigenous and mestizo communities that engage in social practices of transculturated Amerindian translingual literacies, often to resist efforts by powerful groups to oppress them. By drawing on data from studies conducted in Peru (Salomon 2004), Mexico (Wahrhaftig 2006), the USA (Cowan 2007), and transnationally in Coronel-Molina's autoethnography (1999), the authors trace the trajectories of Amerindian translingual literacies from the early modern/colonial period to the postmodern/postcolonial present. They trace the domination of alphabetic-text literacy driven by the ideology of its superiority together with the coexistence of Amerindian translingual literacies driven by the ideology of border gnoseology. The authors merge Urban's (2001) 'metaculture' with Mignolo's (1995) 'colonial semiosis' and literacy as translingual practice (Canagarajah 2013a, 2013b) to account for continuities and discontinuities among semiotic systems in Amerindian literacies. Metaculture, colonial semiosis, and the existing data enable to the authors to recognise previously overlooked texts and the social and literacy practices that produced them as products of border gnoseology and translingualism, and to apprehend Indigenous and mestizo material in autoethnographic texts studied primarily from the perspective of the subaltern appropriation of dominant paradigms.

The third article, 'Towards translingual and transcultural practice: Explorations in a white-majority, rural, midwestern elementary classroom' by Alexandra Panos, examines the use of digital tools in the classroom, and how these can be used for translingual and transcultural literacy practices in an otherwise monocultural and monolingual setting. The author argues for broader conceptions of 'mono' settings, using the unit of study as the tool with which to explore literacy practices across spaces. Her data and her insights are based on a recent classroom ethnography in a White-majority, English-only, rural 6th grade classroom in the Midwestern US. Her analysis also takes into account the challenges of rural poverty and the complexities of using digital tools by examining the role digital tools, *placed resources* (Prinsloo 2005), play in marginalised settings. Ultimately, the author offers insights into how researchers and teachers might support and approach 'mono' elementary classroom literacy practices by connecting with other spaces around the world to help students engage with digital tools and global partners. Such work can also be understood as transcultural practice offering the potential for translingual practice.

The fourth article, 'An ethnographic portrait of translingual/transcultural navigation among immigrant children and youth: Voices during Sunday school at a Latino church', by Stacy Penalva, foregrounds the voices of 34 grade-schoolers and high-schoolers who are members of immigrant families from Mexico and Central America. The author conducted focus groups during Sunday school classes with these children on the topics of their language(s), their culture(s), and citizenship, and made note of recurrent themes in the children's insightful perceptions. Some of the most prominent of these included their own language use and fluency, the use of 'Spanglish', language and

family relationships, the relationships between language, culture and identity, and linguistic agency. The goal of the study was to 'turn up the volume on these immigrant voices and illuminate the process through which children with feet in more than one language, culture and country navigate and make decisions about their lives'. In the end, it achieved this goal by identifying the unique set of skills and understandings that these young people have for making meaning across and through cultures, languages, and national ties.

The fifth article, 'Créolization and the new cosmopolitanism: Examining twenty-first century student identities and literacy practices for transcultural understanding' by Erin Moira Lemrow, looks at how US classrooms today reflect the rapid demographic shifts in contemporary American society through the identities of twenty-first-century students. In particular, the author offers an ethnographic case study that examines the literacy practices of one Filipino/American student, using créolisation theory to discuss and contextualise the local meaning-making that takes place against global and colonial designs. Ultimately, this essay constitutes a paradigm shift in education, focusing on articulating student reality, while also providing theoretical frameworks for further discussion, and highlighting the possibility for active engagement with cosmopolitanism.

The final article, 'Translingual practice among African immigrants in the United States: Embracing the mosaicness of the English language' by James Kigamwa and Michael Ndemanu, is an exploration of the 'need to embrace translingualism in order to avert covert tensions that emanate from the ascription of linguistic supremacy to "standard" English, especially among teachers of immigrant children'. This essay is inspired in the 1974 resolutions of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and the 1996 Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (UDLR); both of these documents stress the importance of empowering students to 'own' their languages. To this end, Kigamwa and Ndemanu examine the diversity of world Englishes in the areas of orthography, grammar, lexis, and phonology. Africa, as a site of innumerable colonial situations, is now home to a profusion of Indigenous and European languages. All of these have contributed to the emergence of a wide variety of Englishes; as a result, African immigrants in the USA speak English with varying accents and proficiencies. A number of factors influence the translingual nature of English spoken by these immigrants, ranging from 'medium of instruction in their countries of origin; duration of exposure to "standard" English; age at immigration to the US; and their willingness to yield to social pressure to speak English like mainstream Americans'. The authors argue that linguistic diversity must be respected. Since the primary purpose of language is communication, there should be no dialect of English (or any other language) that is considered superior to any other. Throughout the article, both historical and contemporary sociolinguistic realities of African immigrants' English speech are considered in terms of their ability to facilitate or impede African immigrants' acculturation to their host country.

This volume ends with two book reviews. The first one is by Beth L. Samuelson on the book *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*, edited by A. Suresh Canagarajah. The second one is by Melissa Brundick McNabb on the book *Time and space in literacy research*, edited by Catherine Compton-Lilly and Erica Halverson.

Conclusions and further directions

The articles presented herein make significant contributions to the study of language contact and translingual literacies. Much work still needs to be done, though. The notion of translingual literacies itself still needs further exploration since it is a complex concept that encompasses not only the mosaic of translingual literacies, but also the multiplicity of contexts worldwide. Due to these multilingual and translingual contexts and contact situations, it would be interesting to explore further the application of translingual literacies to diverse situations and topics within Literacy Studies as a whole. This would help elucidate, for instance, the differences and relationships among multilingual literacies, multiple literacies and translingual literacies. Another path to follow in future research would be the exploration of language contact phenomena and translingual literacies from

interdisciplinary perspectives. The scope of research on these issues is still in the beginning stages. More research is needed to fill in these gaps. In particular, comparative studies between translingual literacies in the Americas and in the rest of the world is fundamental. Likewise, substantial data collection and documentation from multiple perspectives on translingual literacies are necessary.

Notes

1. Important works on language contact phenomena include Bakker and Matras (2003), Bakker and Mous (1994), Clyne (2003), Coronel-Molina and Rodríguez-Mondoñedo (2012), Holm (2000), Hicky (2010), Milroy and Muysken (1995), Muysken (2000), Myers-Scotton (2006), Raymond (2010), Romaine (1995), Sebba (1997), Thomason and Kaufman (1988), Thomason (1997), Wei (2000), Winford (2003), and Weinreich (1953/1974), among others.
2. Selected references on codeswitching, codemixing, and codemeshing are Aguirre (1988), Berk-Seligson (1986), Bowen and Whithaus (2013), Cheng and Buttler (1989), De Houwer and Lanza (1999), Eastman (1992), Gumperz (1982), Heller (1988, 1992), Jacobson (1990), Lu and Horner (2013), Matsuda (2014), Myers-Scotton and Jake (1997), Rounsaville (2014), Selfe and Horner (2013), Schieffelin (1993), Street, Pahl, and Rowsell (2009), Tay (1989), Wright, Boun, and Garcia (2015), and Zentella (1997), among others.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank several people who made this volume possible. First, we are profoundly indebted to the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (*JMMD*) editor John Edwards, and to the production team for helping us to make this project happen. We also express our deepest gratitude to the authors for their singular and innovative contributions and for their invaluable comments and suggestions for the introduction of this volume. Last but not least, our heartfelt thanks also go to the reviewers for their detailed and rigorous comments, which inspired a rich, insightful exchange with the authors. Without the generous assistance of all these fine people and institutions, this special issue would not be a reality.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Beth L. Samuelson http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5851-6657

References

Aguirre, A. 1988. "Code Switching, Intuitive Knowledge, and the Bilingual Classroom." In *Ethnolinguistic Issues in Education*, edited by H. Garcia and R. Chavez, 28–38. Lubbock: Texas Tech University.

Augustyn, P. 2012. "On Semiotics in Language Education." *Semiotica* 192 (1–4): 523–533.

Baker, C. 2011. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 5th ed. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C., and S. P. Jones. 1998. *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bakker, P., and Y. Matras, eds. 2003. *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bakker, P., and M. Mous, eds. 1994. *Mixed Languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Berk-Seligson, S. 1986. "Linguistic Constraints on Intra-Sentential Code-Switching: A Study of Spanish/Hebrew Bilingualism." *Language in Society* 15: 313–348.

Blackledge, A., and A. Creese. 2010. *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective*. London: Continuum.

Bowen, T., and C. Whithaus. 2013. *Multimodal Literacies and Emerging Genres*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. 2006. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *National Council of Teachers of English* 57 (4): 586–619.

Canagarajah, A. S. 2011. "Codeswitching in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging." *Modern Language Journal* 95: 401–417.

Canagarajah, S. 2013a. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S., ed. 2013b. *Literacy as Translingual Practice between Communities and Classrooms*. New York: Routledge.

Cheng, L. R., and K. Buttler. 1989. "Code Switching: A Natural Phenomenon Versus Language Deficiency." *World Englishes* 8: 293–309.
Clyne, M. 2003. *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cook, V. J. 2008. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
Coronel-Molina, S. M. 1999. "Crossing Borders and Constructing Indigeneity: A Self Ethnography of Identity." In *Indigeneity Construction and Re/Presentation*, edited by J. N. Brown, and P. M. Sant, 59–75. Commack, NY: Nova Science.
Coronel-Molina, S. M., and M. Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, eds. 2012. "Language Contact and Universal Grammar in the Andes." Special issue of *Lingua*, 122 (5): 447–528.
Cowan, P. 2007. "¡Adelante! Conectándose al pasado, anhelando el futuro a través del discurso visual latino." *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa* 12 (34), julio-septiembre 2007: 951–986.
Crystal, D. 1997. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 4th ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
Danesi, M. 2000. *Semiotics in Language Education*. Berlin: M. de Gruyter.
De Houwer, A., and E. Lanza. 1999. "Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective." *Anthropological Linguistics* 41 (3): 409–411.
Eastman, C., ed. 1992. "Code Switching." Special Issue of *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13: 1–17.
Franceschini, R. 2011. "Multilingualism as Multicompetence: A Conceptual View." *Modern Language Journal* 95: 344–355.
García, O. 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
García, O. 2012. Theorizing Translanguaging for Educators. In *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*, edited by C. Celic and K. Sheltzer. Accessed December 10, 2016. http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2012/06/FINAL-Translanguaging-Guide-With-Cover-1.pdf.
García, O., and C. Sylvan. 2011. "Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities." *Modern Language Journal* 95 (iii): 385–400.
Garcia, O., and L. Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gumperz, J. J. 1982. "Conversational Code Switching." In *Discourse Strategies*, edited by J. J. Gumperz, 59–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Harris, R. 2001. *Rethinking Writing*. New York: Continuum.
Heller, M, ed. 1988. *Code Switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Heller, M. 1992. "The Politics of Code-Switching and Language Choice." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13 (1/2): 123–142.
Hicky, R, ed. 2010. *Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
Holm, J. 2000. *An Introduction to Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hornberger, N. H., and H. Link. 2012. "Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A Bilingual Lens." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15 (3): 261–268.
Jacobson, R., ed. 1990. *Codeswitching as a Worldwide Phenomenon*. New York: Lang.
Kellman, S., ed. 2003. *Switching Languages: Translingual Writers Reflect on Their Craft*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Kramsch, C. 2009. *The Multilingual Subject: What Foreign Language Learners Say About their Experience and why it Matters*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
Kress, G. 2010. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. New York: Routledge.
Language Contact. Accessed January 2, 2016. https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/ikos/EXFAC03-AAS/h05/larestoff/linguistics/Chapter%206.(H05).pdf.
Lewis, G., B. Jones, and C. Baker. 2012. "Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and Beyond." *Education Research and Evaluation* 18 (7): 641–654.
Lovejoy, K. B., S. Fox, and K. V. Wills. 2009. "From Language Experience to Classroom Practice Affirming Linguistic Diversity in Writing Pedagogy." *Pedagogy* 9 (2): 261–287.
Lu, M.-Z., and B. Horner. 2013. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English* 75 (6): 582–607. Web. Accesses July 5, 2014.
Marshall, S., and D. Moore. 2013. "2b or not 2b Plurilingual? Navigating Languages Literacies, and Plurilingual Competence in Postsecondary Education in Canada." *TESOL Quarterly* 47 (3): 472–499.
Matsuda, P. K. 2014. "The Lure of Translingual Writing." *PMLA* 129 (3): 478–83.
Michael-Luna, S., and A. S. Canagarajah. 2007. "Multilingual Academic Literacies: Pedagogical Foundations for Code Meshing in Primary and Higher Education." *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4 (1): 55–77.
Mignolo, W. D. 1995. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Milroy, L., and P. Muysken, eds. 1995. *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Modern Language Association of America. 2007. *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*. New York: Author.
Muysken, P. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Myers-Scotton, C. 2006. *Multiple Voices*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Myers-Scotton, C., and J. L. Jake. 1997. "Codeswitching and Compromise Strategies: Implications for Lexical Structure." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 1 (1): 3–24.
Ong, W. J. 1986. "Writing is a Technology that Restructures Thought." In *The Written Word: Literacy in Transition*, edited by G. Baumann, 23–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Pierce, B. 1995. "Social Identity, Investment, and Learning." *TESOL Quarterly* 29 (1): 9–31.
Pratt, M.L. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession* 91: 33–40. New York: MLA.
Pratt, M. L. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
Prinsloo, M. 2005. "The New Literacies as Placed Resources." *Perspectives in Education* 24 (3): 1–12.
Raymond, H., ed. 2010. *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Rounsaville, A. 2014. "Situating Transnational Genre Knowledge: A Genre Trajectory Analysis of one Student's Personal and Academic Writing." *Written Communication* 31: 332–364.
Salomon, F. 2004. *The Cord Keepers: Khipus and Cultural Life in a Peruvian Village*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Sánchez Martín, C. 2013. *Intercultural Communication Cristina - Blog*. Accessed November 25, 2015. http://icristinasm. blogspot.com/2013/02/code-switching-and-code-meshing.html.
Sankoff, G. 2001. "Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact." In *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, edited by P. Trudgill, J. Chambers, and N. Schilling-Estes, 638–668. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Schieffelin, B. B. 1993. "Code-Switching and Language Socialization: Some Probable Relationships." In *Pragmatics: From Theory to Practice*, edited by J. Duchan, L. Hewitt, and R. Sonnenmeier, 20–42. New York: Prentice Hall.
Sebba, M. 1997. *Contact Languages: Pidgins and Creoles*. London: MacMillan.
Selfe, C., and B. Horner. 2013. Translinguality/Transmodality Relations: Snapshots from a Dialogue. *The Working Papers Series on Negotiating Differences in Language and Literacy*. University of Louisville. Accessed February 2, 2016. http://louisville.edu/workingpapers/doc/self-horner-working-papers-version.
Street, B. 1994. "Cross-cultural Perspectives on Literacy." In *Functional Literacy: Theoretical Issues and Educational Implications*, edited by L. Verhoeven, 95–111. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Street, B., K. Pahl, and J. Rowsell. 2009. *Multimodality and New Literacy Studies: The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*, edited by Carey Jewitt, 191–200. New York: Routledge.
Tay, M. W. J. 1989. "Code Switching and Code Mixing as a Communicative Strategy in Multilingual Discourse." *World Englishes* 8 (3): 407–417.
Thomason, S. G. 1997. *Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Thomason, S. G., and T. Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Oxford: University of California Press.
Translingualism. *Wikipedia*. Accessed October 16, 2015. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Translingualism.
Urban, G. 2001. *Metaculture: How Culture Moves Through the World.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Van Lier, L. 2004. *The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning: A Sociocultural Perspective*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
Wahrhaftig, A. 2006. "Pictorial State of the Culture: Representations in Tepoztlan, Morelos." Paper presented at the 2006 Meeting of the Latin America Studies Association, San Juan, Puerto Rico, March 15–18.
Wei, L. 2000. *The Bilingualism Reader*. London: Routledge.
Wei, L. 2011. "Moment Analysis and Translanguaging Space: Discursive Construction of Identities by Multilingual Chinese Youth in Britain." *Journal of Pragamatics* 43: 1222–1235.
Weinreich, U. 1953/1974. *Language in Contact, Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
Wetzl, A. M. 2013. "World Englishes in the Mainstream Composition Course: Undergraduate Students Respond to WE Writing." *Research in the Teaching of English* 48 (2): 204–227.
Williams, C. 1994. *Arfarniad o ddulliau ac addysgu yng nghyddestum addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.
Williams, C. 1996. "Secondary Education Teaching in the Bilingual Situation." In *The Language Policy: Taking Stock*, edited by C. Williams, G. Lewis, and C. Baker, 39–78. Llangefni: CAI.
Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Wright, W. E., S. Boun, and O. Garcia. 2015. *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
Young, V. A., and A. Y. Martinez, eds. 2011. *Code-Meshing as World English: Pedagogy, Policy, Performance*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
Zentella, A. C. 1997. *Growing up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.